Source: ?

survey library

KIN CLASSIFICATION IN THE KARAKORUM

ROBERT PARKIN

Institut für Ethnologie, Berlin

The kinship terminologies of the isolated language Burushaski and the Indo-European language Shina are examined, and both are shown to have a symmetric or two-line prescriptive pattern. This means that the latter is untypical for an Indo-European terminology, and it also contradicts the view sometimes put forward that non-prescriptive terminologies cannot adopt prescriptive features secondarily. It is argued, however, that the contradiction can be resolved in the present case, where change has been limited to large-scale lexical transfer as part of a general process of language-switching, the overall semantic scheme remaining the same. As with a number of similar theoretical treatments the article locates specific kinship terminologies and their changes in a historical framework.

Despite the often fierce ahistoricism of the functionalists, the interest in matching anthropology and history never completely went away, and it has become a commonplace to point out its revival in the last few decades. One aspect of this has been a renewed preparedness in some quarters not only to look for possible changes in the patterning of kinship terminologies, but also to account for them theoretically. This has been rather overshadowed by rival approaches, above all, perhaps, those of componential and semantic analysis. It has not been so unified as these other approaches, but it is hardly more recent: Dole's thesis on this theme carries the date 1957 (see also 1972), only a year after Goodenough's [illegible] first publications announcing the arrival of the opposite camp, and Service was soon to follow with a similar article (1960). Later, some of Needham's analyses led him to make similar if briefer theoretical points (e.g. 1967, 1974), and Allen has very recently offered a more programmatic statement of the basic theoretical arguments and most plausible long-term trends (1986). At the same time, however, there has been an eagerness to avoid the mistakes of previous eras, first, by recognising that change is not inevitable, and secondly, by distinguishing terminological changes very clearly from changes in social ideology and behaviour.

The results of this work vary, but the most significant conclusion from the point of view of the present article is that the change from prescriptive to non-prescriptive that particular terminologies may undergo is very unlikely to be reversed (e.g. Allen 1986: 108). The evidence is similarly varied. One study published fifty years ago used documentary and epigraphic sources to show how the Chinese terminology has ceased to be prescriptive over a period of more than two thousand years (Fêng Han-yi 1937).

Man (N.S.) 22, 157–179

Man (N.S.) 22, pp 157-170

Should be 1987 (if Man (N.S.) 10 = 1975 see bib)

But although such evidence is rarely available, it is also possible to uncover changes, usually over a shorter period, by comparing the terminologies of closely related languages, or through linguistic history, or both. Examples of this, by linguists as well as anthropologists, include Needham's and Blust's work on a number of Austronesian languages, Allen's and Benedict's on Tibeto-Burman, Benedict's on T'ai, Trautmann's and Tyler's on Dravidian, Szemérenyi's and many others' on Indo-European, my own and Zide's on Munda, and Dyen and Aberle's on Athapaskan (yet more examples are listed in the latter, 1974: 1).

The present article uses similar methods to analyse the terminology of Burushaski, a genetically isolated language consisting of two dialects spoken in the western Karakorum. This proves to agree essentially with the symmetric or two-line prescriptive terminologies found in the Himalayas to the east and in south and central India. The presence of such terminologies has not been suspected in this area until very recently, yet it is not the only instance. Shina, a neighbouring Indo-European (IE) language, also proves to have the same basic pattern. Shina is therefore anomalous, in that it belongs to a language family not normally associated with this type of kin classification, either at the present day or at any recorded period in the past (see especially the discussion of this in Szemérenyi 1978). Yet despite this anomaly it is not unique. The well-established contrast between the terminologies of north and south India (including Sri Lanka) is also largely one between IE and Dravidian languages, but the correspondence is not a complete one: in areas of transition there are a number of terminologies which are 'Dravidian' in their semantic configuration but lexically IE (e.g. Marathi, Konkani, Sinhalese – see Trautmann 1981: 147 sqq.). Other examples occur in the Himalayas, e.g. Pahari.

Historical linguistics would tend to suggest that these are all the result of innovation because of the absence of prescription from the terminologies of the recorded ancestral languages, as well as from any of the proto-languages that have been reconstructed from them. Conversely, such innovations seem on the face of it to contravert the theoretical position that non-prescriptive terminologies do not become prescriptive. In the present case the contradiction can quite easily be overcome, and the final section of the article will argue how.

The linguistic and ethnographic background

First, however, it will be useful to give a more detailed account of the linguistic geography of the area and to sketch in the ethnographic background.

Burushaski itself has two main dialects. According to the 1931 Census of India, the last available for this area, the dialect most usually called Burushaski (abridged here to Bu) was spoken by about 20,000 people in the Hunza and Nagir valleys, while Werchikwar (abridged here to Wk) was the dialect of about 7,500 people in the Yasin valley to the west.[1] The most recent figures record a population of 26–30,000 Burusho for the Hunza and Nagir valleys, out of a total Burusho population of about 60,000 (Tahir Ali 1981: 233, 249n.3; Fremont

1984: 117), while somewhat earlier Jettmar gave a figure of almost 50,000 Burushaski speakers in Hunza, Nagir and Yasin together (1959: 90). Compared with Bu, Wk 'is markedly different and is certainly to be ranked as a distinct dialect' (D. Lorimer 1927: 509), though probably not as a separate language by the conventional test of mutual intelligibility. It is closer to Nagir than to Hunza Bu (D. Lorimer 1937: 72), there being slight dialectal differences between these also, and even within Hunza itself (D. Lorimer 1935*a*: xlix). No connexion has ever been established between this tiny group of dialects and any other language family, not even those in its immediate area. Attempts to link it with certain Caucasian languages have not won lasting acceptance, nor has Barbour's proposed link with the Munda languages of Bihar and Orissa, on the basis of the pronominalised affixation and vigesimal counting common to both (1921). (These and other even less plausible theories are discussed in Morgenstierne 1935: xii sqq.)

Although there are a number of IE languages in this general area, two in particular have had a marked influence on Burushaski, namely Shina on Bu and Khowar on Wk, though influence has by no means been in only one direction. Lorimer thought that Gilgit was entirely Bu-speaking before the Shen invasions. In his day Shina had only intruded into the lower Hunza and lower Nagir valleys, but the Shen's high social status in the area – one section of them has provided the local rulers for at least six centuries – was reflected in that of their language. This is especially so of Nagir, with more Shina speakers than Hunza, and these linguistic influences have been reinforced by frequent intermarriages between Shen and Burusho. By contrast, Domaki, the IE language of the Doms or Berichos, professional musicians and blacksmiths of the area, has had no discernible influence on Bu, this being due partly to their small numbers and relatively recent immigration into the area from Baltistan and further south, and partly to the low status associated with their professions (D. Lorimer 1935*a*: xliii; 1937: 66, 69–71, 96).

In Yasin, Wk is the indigenous language, but it has been influenced by IE Khowar, the language of the traditional ruling Khushwaqt and Kator families, who have been in the area for some two centuries (D. Lorimer 1937: 71, 96–8). Generally, Wk, like Yasin itself, has been [illegible]ject to foreign influences than Bu and its area (D. Lorimer 1935*a*: lv–lv; Berger 1962: 43), but Khowar seems to have been gaining ground in the valley in recent decades: in Lorimer's day, Wk was the mother tongue of almost all its 8,000 inhabitants (1937: 71), but today Khowar is reported to be the language of a third of all Yasinis (Morin & Dagenais 1977: 308). In both Yasin and Hunza, Urdu is increasingly making an impact through the army, administration, schools, Gilgit market, etc. (Morin *et al.* 1979: 137; Berger 1962: 43), while Wakhi has long been spoken in the north of both valleys. Unlike Shina and Khowar, however, neither seems to have had any significant influence over Burushaski kinship terminology, and we can henceforward disregard them both.

The remaining languages of this area are Turki to the north, of little significance in the present context, and some Tibeto-Burman (TB) languages to the east, of which Balti is an immediate neighbour of Bu. It is possible that these TB languages have had more influence on Burushaski than has generally been

realised. I have discussed this possibility as regards kin terms at greater length elsewhere (Parkin 1987), so I will restrict myself here to brief comments at appropriate points in the analysis below.

A great deal of what little ethnography there is on the Burusho is now quite old, although in recent years interest has been revived by some French, German and Canadian linguists and anthropologists. The complexities of their social organisation and stratification were described briefly by D. Lorimer (1935*a*: xliii–xliv), whose sketch has been elaborated and broadly confirmed since (Tahir Ali 1981: 234 sqq.; Frémont 1984). The basis of the economy is the irrigated cultivation of cereals and vegetables (Lorimer 1935*a*: xliii, xliv). As for religion, the Burusho of Hunza have been Ismailites since about the second quarter of the nineteenth century, after a roughly equivalent period of Shiism; Nagir has remained Shiite, however (D. Lorimer 1935*a*: xli). Islamisation does not seem to have affected social values markedly, at least not before the 1930's, when women still went unveiled and were considered by the Lorimers to be free and open in their ordinary interaction with men. There is, however, apparently one exception: although the traditional alliance system seems to have enjoined patrician exogamy and a ban on first-cousin marriage, Leitner (1893) recorded the occasional indulgence of the wealthy in the latter as far back as the 1860's, a trend confirmed by the Lorimers seventy years later; most probably, this is simply the common Islamic preference for marriage between the children of two brothers. Although the terminology is prescriptive, there is no mention in the literature of any positive marriage rules. Marriage is to some degree by choice, though the negotiations are carried out via an intermediary or *herangush*. There are apparently some counter-prestations as well as a brideprice, and the ceremony is carried out partly in the bride's father's house and partly in the groom's; postmarital residence is virilocal (D. Lorimer 1935*a*: xlvi; 1935*b*: 299, 305; E. O. Lorimer 1936: 250–1; 1938: 15; Leitner 1893: 24). The presence in D. Lorimer's dictionary of a word for 'co-wife' (Bu *umagus*, from *gus*, 'wife' — 1938: 517) indicates some polygyny.

The Burushaski terminology

The analysis of the Burushaski terminology which follows uses all the relevant published and in one case unpublished data available. The former consists chiefly of D. Lorimer's dictionary (1938) for both dialects and Berger 1974 for Wk, but these are supplemented by two useful older sources (Leitner 1893 and Biddulph 1880) and by Morin *et al.* 1979. Even though these are all linguistic rather than anthropological in content and therefore do not concentrate on kinship terminology as such, they nevertheless convey sufficiently detailed information to allow the nature of the Burushaski system to emerge. Moreover, Dr Adam Nayyar has recently collected further very useful information on Bu (from Hunza) which adequately fills most of the remaining gaps.[2]

Table 1 gives a consolidated list of the published kin terms and their recorded glosses for the two main dialects, with Nayyar's hitherto unpublished data in a

separate column. Note that the following abbreviations are used for kin specifications in this article:

P	parent	G	sibling	C	child	E	spouse
F	father	B	brother	S	son	H	husband
M	mother	Z	sister	D	daughter	W	wife
os	opposite sex	ss	same sex	ms	male speaker		
e	elder	y	younger	ws	female speaker		

The abbreviations os, ss, ms, ws, refer to the whole specification when in final position.[3] Some descriptive terms and loans from other languages of no particular systemic significance have been omitted in table 1, being synonyms of the more usual indigenous terms generally restricted to ruling circles. Those loans which cast some light on the analysis, however, have been retained.

We start with the outer reaches of the terminology. In the +3 level, Wk has *di-bap* (PPF), *di-wauc* (PPM), of which at least the former seems to be IE. In the +2 level, both main terms seem to be loans. Bu *dado* (PF) is certainly IE, while Wk *pe* (PF) and Bu *api* (PM—perhaps PF also, but Leitner (1893: 22) says that *dado* is better) is probably TB. It certainly seems to be a separate term from Bu *bapo*, Wk *bap*, PF, which is IE (D. Lorimer 1938: 469; Berger 1974: 132; Morin *et al.* 1979: 140).

There is no lexical connexion with the reciprocal −2 level, where Wk *mes*, Bu *amis*, is the sole recorded term. This also seems to be TB in origin, even though it is normally applied there to the +2 level only. If this is a loan, it means that Burushaski has no indigenous terms in the +2 or −2 levels of its terminology. This is to say the least unusual, but it is possible to suggest an explanation on comparative grounds. It is quite common for symmetric prescriptive terminologies elsewhere (e.g. in Australia, South America, central India) to have terms equating these levels. Sometimes such equations incorporate ego's level also, which reinforces still further the sense of unity they provide between sets of alternating genealogical levels. (A particularly good example of this is the terminology of the Juang in central India – see McDougal 1964: 329). Possibly the original Burushaski terminology followed the same principle, the indigenous terms that covered these levels now being found only in ego's level (discussed below), having been replaced in the others by TB loans.

The remainder of the analysis will deal with the +1, −1 and ego's level in that order. In Bu, *uy*, *aya*, *augah* designate both F and FB, and are probably connected with *aa*, *au*, *u* in Wk.[4] The Wk forms, however, are today restricted to F, and an IE loan, *tati*, serves as both F and FB. Similarly, while *mi* (like Nayyar's *mama*[5]) is both M and MZ in Bu, it is restricted to M in Wk, where *nani*, another IE loan (Berger 1974: 167), is both M and MZ. Thus in Bu, P = PssG, while in Wk even the IE loans have this pattern, despite the restriction of the indigenous terms to P only.

The terms for cross relatives demand rather more discussion. Fairly straightforward is Bu *ntso*, FZ, MBW, which has a Wk cognate in *nzu* (glossed as 'Tante (väterlicher- und mütterlicherseits)' by Berger—1974: 168, 214), while *ngo* appears in both dialects as MB.[6] More problematic is the root *nana*, which at first sight seems IE, especially in view of its similarity to *nani* (above). Neither

TABLE 1. *Burushaski kin terms*

Genealogical level	Bu	Wk	Nayyar's data (Bu)
+3		†di-bap PPF di-waw PPM	
+2	¶api PM †dado PF †bapo PF	¶pe PF †bap PF	¶api PM †dado PF, PMB
−2	¶amis CS	¶mes CC	¶amis SC, SCE
+1	uy F, FB aya F, FB mi M, MZ mama M ¶nana MB, FZ ngo MB ntso FZ, MBW askir EF, WFB askus EM	u F aa, au F †tati FB mi M †nani M, MZ ¶nane PB, PZH ¶nene FZ ngu MB nzu PZ skir LF skus EM	augah F, FB mama M, MZ ¶nana FZ, MB, MBW, FZH askir HF askus WM
−1	iS ai D sagun ZC, WBC, HZC xakm SW arar DH	yu D ai, iD sagun GC xakm SW rar DH	ei S, ssGS ai D, ssGD asagun osGC akhaikm SW arar DH
0	¶acho Bms, Zws, 'brother-in-law' ms, HZ ullas Bws, HB yas Zms, WZ rik WB, ZHms, BWws, HZ sidir DHFws, CEFms sigus CEMws uyer H hir H hapkum H, W †jamant H, W us W umagus co-wife	¶acho Bms, Zws hulus Bws, HB, WB yast Zms rek WB, ZHms, BWws, HZ †sari W B, WZ? †sarom HB, WZ, BWms, ZHws †tuxmuran CEP yuher H hir H nn H us W	¶acho eB, eZ, HBW, WBW, WZH echo HeB avas yB, yZ, WZ arik WeB oyar H os W

† = IE loan ¶ = TB loan

Lorimer nor Berger nor Morin *et al.* gloss it as an IE loan, however, even though they are all ready enough to record definite cases of borrowing elsewhere. In fact, on both semantic and lexical grounds it is more plausibly a loan from TB languages,[7] in which it is almost invariably applied to cross, not parallel +1 relatives, as in Burushaski but in contrast to IE *nani*. Biddulph

mentions it simply as an address term for MB, *ngo* (MB) and *ntso* (FZ) being 'third person pronouns', i.e. terms of reference (1880: xxv, xxxviii). In Bu, Leitner glosses it as MB, FZ, FZH, while Nayyar includes MBW as well (i.e. covering all +1 cross relatives of both sexes), and even Lorimer records it as FZ, MB.[8] As for Wk, Berger gives *nene* as FZ but not as MB. Morin *et al.* do not restrict the term to cross relatives, however, giving the (presumably identical) *nane* as 'oncle (maternel, paternel et par alliance)', and not giving it any female reference at all (1979: 147), thus completely contradicting Berger. This may simply reflect lack of discrimination on their part, but an alternative explanation is that they are right and other recent authorities wrong, and that the Wk +1 pattern is changing from one of P = PssG ≠ PosG to one of PssG = PosG ≠ P. This would accord well with the break-up of the equations F = FB and M = MZ mentioned above. Clearly, however, the overall tendency is to regard *nana* as a term for cross relatives only, which are therefore opposed to parallel relatives in this level. Indeed, in Bu we can construct the pattern P = PssG(E) ≠ PosG(E), this being wholly characteristic of symmetric prescriptive terminologies; and a similar pattern can be discerned in Wk, despite its relatively greater instability.

To complete the picture in the +1 level, there are just two affinal terms: Bu *askir* (EF, WFB), Wk *skir* (EF); and Bu *askus*, Wk *skus* (both EM). Morgenstierne derives these from *hir*, 'man', and *gus*, 'woman', respectively (1945: 74), which may mean that they are new coinings absent from the original terminology. If this were indeed the case, it raises the possibility that the present-day terms for PosG(E) originally covered these specifications also, as in the ideal symmetric prescriptive scheme.

Turning to the reciprocal −1 level, we find Bu *i*, *ei*, Wk *ye* as S, and Bu *ai*, Wk *ai*, *i*, as D. In most sources, *sagun* appears as GC for both dialects. D. Lorimer tells us, however, that in Bu, at least, this term originally referred to ZC only, BC being equated with C, as is still often the case in practice (1938: 306). Nayyar's data expand on this by clearly separating all cross from parallel relatives in the formula C = ssGC ≠ osGC (*ei/ai* ≠ *sagun*). Furthermore, Leitner glosses *sagun* as WBC, HZC (though not as osGC), applying either descriptive terms or the terms for C to WZC, HBC. Taking all these sources together, therefore, we can construct a symmetric prescriptive configuration of meanings for the −1 level with the formula C = (E)ssGC ≠ (E)osGC. Lorimer's remark may, however, indicate that this area of the terminology, like its reciprocal in +1, is ceasing to separate cross from parallel relatives and is moving towards a non-prescriptive pattern of ssGC = osGC ≠ C.

The −1 affinal specifications SW and DH are designated by the terms *xakin* (both dialects) and *arar* (Bu), *rar* (Wk), respectively;[9] the former must be regarded as an independent term, despite its morphological similarity to *sagun*, as the forms recorded by Nayyar make clear (table 1). This separation of CE from (E)osGC parallels that in the reciprocal area of the terminology of EP from PosG(E), but unlike the terms for EP, those for CE are not (or not obviously) new coinings, and cannot be reduced any further. Thus in these two levels, the present-day terminology fails to encompass all the affinal specifications open to it, in view of its otherwise symmetric prescriptive nature (as in Munda—see Parkin 1985).

Ego's level seems to have been a little more unstable diachronically, in common with many other terminologies of this sort.[10] Nonetheless, the underlying pattern is readily discernible.

The treatment of cognatic kin is straightforward enough, both dialects being in agreement. ssG is *acho*, Zms is *yas* (Bu) or *yast* (Wk), and Bws is *ulus* (Bu) or *hulus* (Wk). All the Bu terms, however, as well as Wk *hulus*, have some extra, affinal, specifications. The possible reason for this will only become apparent when we have discussed *rik/rek*, the fourth term in this area of the terminology.

It would appear that, even though today restricted to the ss categories of WB, ZHms, HZ, BWws, Bu *rik* was formerly applied to all EG/GE categories. D. Lorimer implies that it once covered at least WZ, HB and BWms also by saying that these meanings (plus FBSWms, who in this context can be regarded as a classificatory BW) are now 'rare, obsolete and objectionable' (1938: 303—he gives no reason for this). If this is indeed the case, then it would seem that the rejected os categories have been transferred to the cognatic terminology, HB and possibly ZHws going to *ulus* and WZ to *yas*—a logical distribution in respect of the particular relative-sex attributes of these terms (see above). In Wk, *rek* is similarly restricted to ss affines, but here the os ones are covered by a Shina loan, *saroni*. This must have been absent from the terminology at one time, which suggests that *rek* too formerly applied to all EG and GE categories, os as well as ss.

There are admittedly[4] one or two anomalies to be noted. In Bu, there is redundancy in the fact that *acho* is recorded not only as ssG, but also as HZ and 'brother-in-law' ms, since these affines are covered already by *rik*, even in its present-day reduced aspect. Similarly, in Wk *hulus* is recorded as HB by both Berger and Lorimer, and as WB by Berger, even though these are covered by *saroni* and *rek* respectively. There seems to be no particular systemic reason for this, and they can probably be regarded purely as synonyms and/or as an aspect of address usage. Berger also records WB as *sari*, another Shina term, no doubt simply a product of bilingualism.[11] Finally, Nayyar's data are in some respects at variance with the foregoing. In particular, he contrasts *acho* and *yas* as eG/yG rather than ssG/Zms, the only source to give any relative-age specifications. This may reflect the fact that *acho* is apparently yet another TB loan, of a root generally meaning eB. Also, no one else records his *echo* (HeB). He confirms *rik* as WB and *yas* as WZ, however, and his reporting some EGE as well as eG specifications for *acho* is significant since it gives us an equivalence that is entirely consistent with the ideal symmetric prescriptive scheme, as too is its separation from EG/GE categories (probably all denoted by *rik/rek* in the ancestral terminology).

Despite these anomalies, however, we can arrive at the following as the basic meanings for these four terms:

acho = ssG; *yas(t)* = Zms; *(h)ulus* = Bws; *rik/rek* = EG, GE

If the ancestral terminology was of symmetric prescriptive type, as the +1 and −1 levels strongly suggest, then *rik* would, in fact, have been the term for cross cousin as well as EG, GE, while the remaining terms would have covered parallel cousins as well as siblings. This is broadly confirmed by the only two sources to take any account of terms for cousins. Leitner simply says that PGS =

B (1893: 22), while Biddulph records PGS as *acho* and PGD as *yas* (1880: xxvii). Such data are hardly exact enough for anthropological purposes, but together with the silence of other sources they do suggest that today, perhaps under IE influence (and as in Munda) *all* PGC categories and not just PssGC ones have become equated with siblings. Conversely *rik*, the postulated term for PosGC in the original terminology, is now confined to the EG and GE specifications formerly associated with it—and in fact to only some of these, in view of the evidence of further, perhaps more recent, contraction (i.e. still within living memory in Lorimer's day—see again 1938: 303).

There are a few other terms from ego's level to be discussed. Bu *sildir*, DHFws, CEFms, and *siligus*, CEMws are, like *askir* and *askus*, derived from *hir* and *gus* respectively (Morgenstierne 1945: 72). Once again, this suggests the coining of new terms to cope with changes in the ancestral terminology, in which CEPss referents would have appeared as cross cousins and CEPos ones as osG. In Wk, Berger records *tuxmiran*, a loan from Khowar, for this field, glossing it as 'Schwiegereltern (gegenseitig). Gegenschwäher' (1974: 182), which can be translated as 'reciprocally used term for EP', i.e. CEP. The fact that a loan is used here suggests again the absence of a specific term, and therefore of an isolable CEP category, from the original terminology. No particular significance is to be drawn from the terms for spouse, since these commonly attract individualising terms even when in principle assimilable to some cross-cousin category. Indigenous independent terms exist in *oyar*, H, and *os*, W (from *gus*, 'woman'—Berger 1974: 184), though at least one IE is loan is also present (*jamant*, for both H and W), and *hir*, 'man', is also used for H.[12]

What, then, might have been the form of the ancestral Burushaski terminology, taking all these factors into account? Table 2 gives the most plausible version:

TABLE 2. The ancestral Burushaski kinship terminology.
a) The terms with their English glosses

+2	= *o level*	PP etc
+1	uy, aya mi, mama	F, FB, M, MZ } & PssGE
	ngo, nana ntso, nana	MB, FZH, FZ, MBW } & EP?
0	acho ulus yas	ssG Bws, CEFws, Zms, CEMws } & PssGC, EGE
	rik	EG, GE PosGC? CEPss?
	uyer us	H W
−1	ei ai sagun arar xakin	S, (E)ssGS D, (E)ssGD (E)osGC DH SW
−2	= *o level*	CC etc

b) Matrix diagram of the semantic scheme

	‖	X
+1	uy/aya ♂ mi/mama ♀	ngo/nana ♂ ntso/nana ♀
+2/0/−2	acho/ulus/yas	rik/uyer/us
−1	ei ♂ ai ♀	sagun/arar ♂ sagun/xakin ♀

This shows that in all essentials the Burushaski kinship terminology is a symmetric prescriptive one, distinguishing cross from parallel relatives in all three medial levels, though using TB loans and merging them in the outer two. The nature of the equations uniting cross relatives in +1 and −1, as well as the overall symmetry of terms for ego's direct affines in his own and the +1 levels, ensure that this is not an asymmetric, three-line terminology, and there are no terms linking adjacent levels. There are some indications that this scheme is beginning to change in a non-prescriptive direction. Fundamentally, however, this is a remarkably economical example of such a terminology, with relatively few sex distinctions, virtually no evidence of relative age, and possibly, at one time, the uniting of the +2 and −2 levels with ego's through common terms (see table 2b).

Shina

We have already noted that at least one terminology of this area, that of Shina, has certain features similar to Burushaski, especially in the +1 level.[13] In the Kohistani dialect, *pkipi* is both FZ and MBW, though IE cognates of this term are usually restricted to the former specification. In addition, there is *bari aje* (literally 'big mother') as both MeZ and FeBW, and *cuni aje* (literally 'little mother') as both MyZ and FyBW. The latter equation also occurs in the central dialect as *cuni ma* ('little mother' again), and although no term is recorded for MeZ, *bari ma* ('big mother') is given for FeBW. Here too, *mamu*, usually just MB in other IE languages, is applied to FZH also. Finally, Nayyar records *pica* as FB, MeZH in the Hunza dialect (unpublished notes) and the lineal equations (in Needham's sense) *mâlo*, F, FB, and *ajye*, M, MZ, in the Astor dialect (1986: 118).

Unlike these equations, the −1 pattern in Shina of C ≠ BC ≠ ZC is not in itself at all anomalous for Indic. But the terms recorded by Bailey and Nayyar (unpublished notes) for ZC (*savuo* or *sazu*, ZS, and *savui* or *sazui*, ZD) closely resemble those given by Leitner for WBC (*sau* or *sazuo*, WBS, and *saui*, WBD), suggesting at least the equation ZC (ms?) = WBC; very similar too is Leitner's *jauo/-i* for HZC. HBC and WZC, by contrast, seem to be served by separate descriptive terms which utilise in part the terms for S and D, so that there is some resemblance here to the Burushaski pattern of C = (E) ssGC ≠ (E)osGC. D. Lorimer partly supports this by recording *zauwo/-i* as BCws and HZC, though less helpful is his addition of WZC to these (personal communication in Turner

1966: 552). Also untypical of Indic terminologies is the failure to separate wife-givers from wife-takers in ego's level. Turner has *jaze*, BWws, HZ (1966: 551), which has been confirmed recently by Nayyar's *zaze*, BW, HZ (unpublished notes) and Turner also records *sa*, WZ, BWws (though also as Z, PGD—1966: 804[14]). Similar equations do, however, occur in IE terminologies further west that are clearly not at all prescriptive in other respects (e.g. Waigali in Nuristan and Pashto in Swat (Jones 1974: 128; Barth 1959: 110)), so their occurrence in Shina may not be significant, despite the configuration of the +1 and −1 levels.

As for the other IE languages in contact with Burushaski, information on Wakhi and Khowar is too slight to allow any similar assessment to be made, but as far as the latter is concerned the few data we have are not encouraging. Biddulph records a common term for both FB and MB (*mik*) in opposition to *tutt*, F, and a common term for both MZ and FZ (*batch*) in opposition to *nun*, M (1880, Appendix H), giving the non-prescriptive pattern P ≠ PG. Nor does D. Lorimer's volume on Dumaki (1939) show appropriate evidence, which is perhaps not surprising in view of the Doms' relatively recent immigration into the area. The only possibly significant fact here is, as with Shina, the uniting of wife-givers and wife-takers in the equation *sheri*, WB, ZH, and *jaje*, HZ, BWws (1939: 210, 237), although, of course, the same objections apply here too. Dumaki also seems to have borrowed two terms from Burushaski, namely *sildir*, CEP, and possibly *mama*, M (1939: 207, 188; but cf. n. 5 above).

Nonetheless, the symmetric prescriptive character of the Shina terminology is evident enough in the +1 and −1 levels, and the fact that this is not at all typical of IE terminologies generally suggests that it is Shina that has moved in the direction of Burushaski rather than vice versa. Yet it would be a simplification to see this just in terms of the influence of one language over another, without taking account of the sociological factors that are present. Writing of the very similar situation found in parts of south India, Trautmann saw the problem in terms of word-for-word linguistic transfer and bilingualism between caste communities speaking different languages (1981: 147 sqq.). This also seems broadly true of the Karakorum, though here one must also take into account the expansion of Shina at the expense of Burushaski over the last few centuries. This expansion seems to have been the result of changes in language use rather than any large-scale human invasion: in other words, over the centuries a considerable part of the original Burushaski-speaking population has switched to Shina, the language of the numerically few but jurally dominant and socially prestigious invaders. While this has involved an almost total transfer of lexis, however, the scheme of kin classification, viewed as a semantic whole, has largely been preserved. In fact, we encountered an example of this very process when discussing the +1 level of the Burushaski terminology. Here, it will be recalled, the original lineal equations are still preserved in Bu along with Burushaski lexical material, but in Wk such material is now used only for F and M. Of course, Wk does have such equations in this level: but today these are constructed only with IE loans, and Burushaski lexis is not involved in them at all. (The rest of the local population has, of course, continued to speak Burushaski and to use basically the original terminology.)

Conclusion

The presence of prescriptive terminologies, mostly two-line, in the Himalayas has long been realised, but until recently nothing of the sort was suspected as far west as Yasin. This raises other questions of local significance, such as whether any other Dardic languages have terminologies resembling Shina's, and whether the influence of TB languages on Burushaski has simply been lexical or is a matter of semantics also. The Shina terminology itself is an example of how IE terminologies can appear to become prescriptive, even though this pattern is not typical of them generally, and despite theoretical indications that such a change is unlikely. Clearly, though, the present situation is exceptional only in the replacing of the original inventory of terms with one from another language, this being just part of the process whereby a whole community seems to have changed languages while preserving the semantic configuration of its original kinship terminology.

The fact that this situation is not in itself unique in south Asia raises a further question as to whether this sort of event may have occurred more frequently in the past, especially in view of the long history of linguistic interaction in this region and the distinctiveness of most north Indian terminologies within IE. Also, it may be a factor worth taking into account in respect of other parts of the world where prescriptive and non-prescriptive terminologies are in contact.

NOTES

[1] The Burushaski dialect will be denoted by the abbreviation Bu, and Werchikwar by Wk, but when both dialects together are intended 'Burushaski' will be spelled out in full. The elements *Burush-* and *Werch-* are very probably cognate, but attached to the latter are the Khowar roots *-ik-* and *-war*, denoting respectively 'the people of a place' and 'language' (D. Lorimer 1935*a*: xlix). The usual name for the people is 'Burusho'.

[2] This new material, which concerns Shina as well as Bu, was utilised by Professor Georg Pfeffer in a paper prepared for the International Conference on Cultures of the Karakorum held in Gilgit in September 1983 (see Pfeffer 1984). I am most grateful to Professor Pfeffer for making this material available to me, as well as to Dr Nayyar for its original collection. Naturally, I accept full responsibility for the exact details of its interpretation here, though it is fair to add that some of the general conclusions had already been anticipated in the paper referred to.

[3] The transliterations of the terms are based on the recorded forms, but they do not follow these entirely and diacritics have been omitted, so they should not be regarded as rigorous. This should not, however, present a problem in the analysis, which is more concerned with the overall semantic scheme than the phonemic content of the terms.

[4] In both dialects, there may in fact be two roots involved here rather than just one (cf. n. 5 below and Parkin 1987, items 7 and 8).

[5] In form, *mama* is identical to the common Indic and Dravidian root for MB, and this may indeed be its source, but equally it may be indigenous, especially since the Burushaski term is applied to M and MZ, different in sex and the latter a parallel, not a cross relative. Terms for 'mother' etc. have a similar form to the above in many different parts of the world in circumstances which normally rule out the possibility of any historical connexion (cf. Leach 1971). This may be true in the present case, despite the geographical proximity between the occurrence of the terms, though the reduplication common to both may be a product of the linguistic convergence well known in south Asia (see Masica 1976).

[6] In his dictionary, D. Lorimer also records *ago* as FB (1938: 276) and gives a passage from his collected parallel texts (1935*b*: 132, line 10, and p. 133) as supporting evidence. The term is clearly translated as MB in this passage, however.

[7] E.g. Balti *nèni*, Kunnauri *nàne*, *ane*, Bhotia, Sherpa, Tamang *ani*, Tibetan *ne* (Parkin 1987: item 4). Benedict says that this root is 'practically universal' in TB and he derives it from Proto-TB **ni ~ *nur* (1942: 317).

[8] And as LB (1935: 274), though once again this is at variance with the passages he cites in support of this interpretation (1935*b*: 135, lines 10, 15, 17, and p. 131), in which the term is nowhere to be found.

[9] *arar* bears a remarkable but probably fortuitous resemblance to *ara*, etc., the standard Munda root for DH: yZH (Parkin 1985).

[10] Compare, for example, Munda (Parkin 1985) and some TB terminologies (Allen 1975); a possible reason for this is discussed in the former reference.

[11] He also gives *sari* as WZ, but says that this gloss comes from Lorimer, who himself had placed a query beside it; I have not been able to find it in any of Lorimer's writings, however.

[12] The latter is also found in Turki (Cunningham 1854: 400; Raquette 1927: 52), though it is not clear which language has borrowed it from which.

[13] The chief sources for Shina kin terms (Leitner 1893 and Bailey 1924) are now very old, but they have been confirmed to some extent by other recent data collected by Nayyar on the Shina of Hunza (unpublished) and the Shina of Astor, further south beyond Gilgit (1986). In view of the relatively small amount of available information and the age of much of it no extended analysis of the Shina terminology will be attempted here.

[14] Cf. Nayyar's *tan* for Astor Shina (1986: 118); unfortunately he does not give any affinal terms for this dialect.

REFERENCES

Allen, N. J. 1975. Byansi kinship terminology: a study in symmetry. *Man* (N.S.) **10**, 80–94.

——— 1976. Sherpa kinship terminology in diachronic perspective. *Man* (N.S.) **11**, 569–87.

——— 1986. Tetradic theory: an approach to kinship. *J. anthrop. Soc. Oxford* **17**, 87–109.

Bailey, T. G. 1924. *Grammar of the Shina language*. London: Royal Asiatic Society.

Barbour, P. L. 1921. Burushaski, a language of northern Kashmir. *J. Am. Orient. Soc.* **41**, 60–72.

Barth, F. 1959. *Political leadership among Swat Pathans*. London: Athlone Press.

Benedict, Paul K. 1942. Tibetan and Chinese kinship terms. *Harvard J. Asiat. Stud.* **6**, 313–37.

Berger, H. 1962. Der Stand der Burušaski-Forschung. *Bull. int. Comm. urgent anthrop. ethnol., Rec.* **5**, 42–4.

——— 1974. *Das Yasin-Burushaski (Werchikwar)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Biddulph, J. 1880. *Tribes of the Hindu Koosh*. Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing.

Cunningham, A. 1854. *Ladak, physical, statistical and historical: with notes of the surrounding countries*. London: Wm. H. Allen & Co.

Dole, G. E. 1957. *The development of patterns of kinship nomenclature*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.

——— 1972. Developmental sequences of kinship patterns. In *Kinship studies in the Morgan centennial year* (ed.) Priscilla Reining. Washington: Anthropological Society.

Dyen, Isidore & David F. Aberle 1974. *Lexical reconstruction: the case of the Proto-Athapaskan kinship system*. Cambridge: Univ. Press.

Feng Han-yi 1937. The Chinese kinship system. *Harv. J. Asiat. Stud.* **2**, 141 sqq.

Frémont, Annette 1984. Remarques sur l'organization des sociétés parlant le burushaski. *Bull. d'Études ind.* **2**, 117–22.

Goodenough, Ward H. 1956. Componential analysis and the study of meaning. *Language* **32**, 195–216.

Jettmar, K. 1959. Urgent tasks of research among the Dardic peoples of eastern Afghanistan and northern Pakistan. *Bull. int. Comm. urgent anthrop. ethnol. Rec.* **2**, 85–96.

Jones, S. 1974. *Men of influence in Nuristan*. London, New York: Seminar Press.

Leach, Edmund 1971. More about 'mama' and 'papa'. In *Rethinking kinship and marriage* (ed.) Rodney Needham. London: Tavistock.

Leitner, G. W. 1893. *The Hunza and Nagyr handbook* (2nd edn). Woking: Oriental University Institute.

Lorimer, D. L. R. 1927. A Burushaski text from Hunza. *Bull. Sch. orient. Stud.* **4**, 505–31.

——— 1935*a*/1935*b*/1938. *The Burushaski language* (3 vols). Oslo: Instituttet Sammenlignende Kulturforskning.

——— 1937. Burushaski and its alien neighbours: problems in linguistic contagion. *Trans. philol. Soc.*, 63–98.

——— 1939. *The Dumaki language*. Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt N.V.

Lorimer, E. O. 1936. Peasant life in Hunza. *Geogr. Mag.* **3**, 235–54.

——— 1938. The Burusho of Hunza. *Antiquity* **12**, 5–15.

Lounsbury, F. G. 1956. A semantic analysis of the Pawnee kinship usage. *Language* **32**, 158–94.

McDougal, C. 1964. Juang categories and joking relationships. *SWest. J. Anthrop.* **20**, 319–45.

Masica, Colin P. 1976. *Defining a linguistic area*. Chicago: Univ. Press.

Morgenstierne, G. 1935. Introduction. In *The Burushaski language* vol. 1 (by) D. L. R. Lorimer. Oslo: Instituttet Sammenlignende Kulturforskning.

——— 1945. Notes on Burushaski phonology. *Norsk Tiddsskr. Sprogvid.* **13**, 61–95.

Morin, Y.-C. & L. Dagenais, 1977. Les emprunts ourdous en bourouchaski. *J. Asiat.* **265**, 305–43.

———, J. Presot & E. Tiffou 1979. Complément au lexique du bourouchaski. *J. asiat.* **267**, 137–53.

Nayyar, Adam 1986. *Astor: eine Ethnographie*. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Needham, Rodney 1967. Terminology and alliance, 2: Mapuche, conclusions. *Sociologus* **17**, 39–53.

——— 1974. The evolution of social classification: the Warao case. *Bijdr. Taal- Land- Volkenk.* **134**, 36–43.

Parkin, R. J. 1985. Munda kinship terminologies. *Man* (N.S.) **20**, 705–21.

——— 1987. Tibeto-Burman and Indo-European loans in Burushaski kinship terminology. *Bull. Sch. Or. Afr. Stud.* **50/2**.

Pfeffer, Georg 1984. Kin classification in Hunza. *J. cent. Asia* **7**, 57–67.

Raquette, G. 1927. *English-Turki dictionary*. Lund: Acta Universitatis Lundensis.

Service, Elman R. 1960. Kinship terminology and evolution. *Am. Anthrop.* **62**, 747–63.

Szemérenyi, O. 1976. Studies in the kinship terminologies of the Indo-European languages. *Acta Iranica* **16**, 1–240.

Tahir Ali 1981. Ceremonial and social structure among the Burusho of Hunza. In *Asian highland societies in anthropological perspective* (ed.) C. von Fürer-Haimendorf. Delhi etc.: Sterling Publishers.

Trautmann, T. 1981. *Dravidian kinship*. Cambridge: Univ. Press.

Turner, R. L. 1966. *A comparative dictionary of the Indo-Aryan languages*. London: Oxford Univ. Press.

RUTH FINNEGAN
Reviews Editor
RICHARD BURGHART
Editorial Board
RICHARD BRADLEY WARWICK BRAY HASTINGS DONNAN
ROBERT FOLEY ANTHONY GOOD RALPH GRILLO
TIM INGOLD CAROL MacCORMACK W. C. McGREW
HOWARD MORPHY JOHN PEEL JOEL SHERZER
ROBIN TORRENCE ERIC TRINKAUS
Assistant Editor
VALERIE G. PHILLIPS

MAN

The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute
is published quarterly for the Fellows and Junior Fellows of the
Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland
in succession to the
Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute and *Man (Old Series)*
which ceased publication in 1965
with Volumes 95 and 65 respectively

Available to non-Fellows: price £50 (US$75) annually
Single issues £14 (US$20) post paid

Mss., books for review, and all editorial correspondence should be addressed to:
The Honorary Editor, *Man*, 56 Queen Anne Street, London W1M 9LA

Correspondence concerning subscriptions, changes of address, missing issues etc. to:
RAI Distribution Centre, Blackhorse Road, Letchworth SG6 1HN, Herts, U.K.

The Fellowship subscription is currently £35 (UK), £30 (US$48) overseas. Fellows also receive *Anthropology Today*, and have library borrowing rights when in the U.K. Applications for Fellowship should be sent to: The Director's Secretary, Royal Anthropological Institute, 56 Queen Anne Street, London W1M 9LA.

Advertising is dealt with by the Assistant Editor, *Man*, 56 Queen Anne Street, London W1M 9LA.

Back numbers of Volume 6 onwards are obtainable from the Distribution Centre, though a few parts are unavailable. Volumes 1–5 of *Man* (N.S.), 1966–1970, are available for $75 per volume in a clothbound reprint edition from Johnson Reprint Corp., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10003, USA ($345 the set). *Man* (N.S.) and the institute's antecedent journals are available on microform from University Microfilms International (White Swan House, Godstone, Surrey RH9 8LW, or 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, USA), except that current volumes of *Man* are not available on microform until two years after year of publication.

Back numbers of *Man (Old Series)* and the old *Journal* may be ordered from Johnson Reprint Co. Ltd, 24–28 Oval Road, London NW1 7DX, when available. Reprints are available from the same firm (but U.S. and Canadian customers should order reprints from Johnson Reprint Corp., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10003). Back numbers

MAN

Man (N.S.) 22, 157–170

THE JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE

NEW SERIES, VOL. 22, NO. 1 MARCH 1987

CONTENTS

DAVID PRICE. *Nambiquara geopolitical organisation* 1
MONIQUE BORGERHOFF MULDER. *Adaptation and evolutionary approaches to anthropology* 25
JENNIFER ALEXANDER & PAUL ALEXANDER. *Striking a bargain in Javanese markets* 42
NANCY TAPPER & RICHARD TAPPER. *The birth of the prophet: ritual and gender in Turkish Islam* 69
SIMON CHARSLEY. *Interpretation and custom: the case of the wedding cake* . 93
JAMES G. CARRIER. *History and self-conception in Ponam society* 111
BRUCE LINCOLN. *Ritual, rebellion, resistance: once more the Swazi Ncwala* . 132
ROBERT PARKIN. *Kin classification in the Karakorum* 157

Correspondence

The cultural context of hunter-gatherer rock art. A. R. WILLCOX; ROBERT LAYTON; J. D. LEWIS-WILLIAMS 171
Maps and wayfinding. C. R. HALLPIKE 175
Compromising relations. J. R. CORBIN & M. P. CORBIN 176
Where the women are, the cattle are not. RAY ABRAHAMS 177

——— 1947*b*. *The uniform of colour: a study of white-black relationship in Swaziland*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand Univ. Press.
——— 1972. A royal ritual in a changing political context. *Cah. Etud. afr.* **12**, 593–615.
——— 1973*a*. Costume and identity. *Comp. Stud. Soc. Hist.* **15**, 348–67.
——— 1973*b*. Costume and cosmology: the animal symbolism of the Ncwala. *Man* (N.S.) **8**, 613–30.
——— 1978*a*. *Sobhuza II: Ngwenyama and King of Swaziland*. New York: Africana.
——— 1978*b*. The monarchy and the military in Swaziland. In *Social system and tradition in southern Africa: essays in honour of Eileen Krige* (eds) J. Argyle & E. P. White. London: Oxford Univ. Press.
Lincoln, Bruce 1985*a*. Notes toward a theory of religion and revolution. In *Religion, rebellion, revolution: an interdisciplinary and cross-cultural collection of essays* (ed.) B. Lincoln. London: Macmillan.
——— 1985*b*. Ancora il mondo alla rovescia: aspetti dell' inversione simbolica. *Ann. Fac. Lett. Fil. Univ. Siena* **6**, 185–200.
Makarius, Laura 1973. Une interprétation de l'Incwala swazi: étude du symbolisme dans la pensée et les rites d'un peuple africain. *Ann. Écon. Soc. Civil.* **28**, 1403–22.
Matsebula, J. S. M. 1976. *A history of Swaziland* (2nd edn) Cape Town: Longman Penguin Southern Africa.
Needham, Rodney 1973. *Right and left: essays on dual symbolic classification*. Chicago: Univ. Press.
Ngubane, Harriet 1977. *Body and mind in Zulu medicine*. London: Academic Press.
Norbeck, Edward 1963. African rituals of conflict. *Am. Anthrop.* **65**, 1254–79.
Potholm, Christian P. 1977. The Ngwenyama of Swaziland: the dynamics of political adaptation. In *African kingships in perspective: political change and modernization in monarchical settings* (ed.) R. Lemarchand. London: Frank Cass.
Raum, O. F. 1967. The interpretation of the Nguni first fruit ceremony. *Paideuma* **13**, 148–63.
Schapera, Isaac 1938. Contact between European and native in South Africa: Bechuanaland. In *Methods of study of culture contact in Africa* (ed.) L. Mair. London: Oxford Univ. Press.
Scott, James C. 1977. Protest and profanation. *Theory and Society* **4**, 1–38, 211–46.
——— 1985. *Weapons of the weak: everyday forms of peasant resistance*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press.
Smith, Pierre 1982. Aspects of the organization of rites. In *Between belief and transgression: structuralist essays in religion, history, and myth* (eds) M. Izard & P. Smith. Chicago: Univ. Press.
Tcherkézoff, Serge 1983. *Le roi Nyamwezi, la droite, et la gauche: révision comparative des classifications dualistes*. Cambridge: Univ. Press.
Turner, Victor 1967. *The forest of symbols: aspects of Ndembu ritual*. Ithaca. N.Y.: Cornell Univ. Press.
Walter, Eugene Victor 1969. *Terror and resistance: a study of political violence, with case studies of some primitive African communities*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

KIN CLASSIFICATION IN THE KARAKORUM

ROBERT PARKIN
Institut für Ethnologie, Berlin

The kinship terminologies of the isolated language Burushaski and the Indo-European language Shina are examined, and both are shown to have a symmetric or two-line prescriptive pattern. This means that the latter is untypical for an Indo-European terminology, and it also contradicts the view sometimes put forward that non-prescriptive terminologies cannot adopt prescriptive features secondarily. It is argued, however, that the contradiction can be resolved in the present case, where change has been limited to large-scale lexical transfer as part of a general process of language-switching, the overall semantic scheme remaining the same. As with a number of similar theoretical treatments the article locates specific kinship terminologies and their changes in a historical framework.

Despite the often fierce ahistoricism of the functionalists, the interest in matching anthropology and history never completely went away, and it has become a commonplace to point out its revival in the last few decades. One aspect of this has been a renewed preparedness in some quarters not only to look for possible changes in the patterning of kinship terminologies, but also to account for them theoretically. This has been rather overshadowed by rival approaches, above all, perhaps, those of componential and semantic analysis. It has not been so unified as these other approaches, but it is hardly more recent: Dole's thesis on this theme carries the date 1957 (see also 1972), only a year after Goodenough's (1956) and Lounsbury's (1956) first publications announcing the arrival of the opposite camp, and Service was soon to follow with a similar article (1960). Later, some of Needham's analyses led him to make similar if briefer theoretical points (e.g. 1967; 1974), and Allen has very recently offered a more programmatic statement of the basic theoretical arguments and most plausible long-term trends (1986). At the same time, however, there has been an eagerness to avoid the mistakes of previous eras, first, by recognising that change is not inevitable, and secondly, by distinguishing terminological changes very clearly from changes in social ideology and behaviour.

The results of this work vary, but the most significant conclusion from the point of view of the present article is that the change from prescriptive to non-prescriptive that particular terminologies may undergo is very unlikely to be reversed (e.g. Allen 1986: 108). The evidence is similarly varied. One study published fifty years ago used documentary and epigraphic sources to show how the Chinese terminology has ceased to be prescriptive over a period of

But although such evidence is rarely available, it is also possible to uncover changes, usually over a shorter period, by comparing the terminologies of closely related languages, or through linguistic history, or both. Examples of this, by linguists as well as anthropologists, include Needham's and Blust's work on a number of Austronesian languages, Allen's and Benedict's on Tibeto-Burman, Benedict's on T'ai, Trautmann's and Tyler's on Dravidian, Szemérenyi's and many others' on Indo-European, my own and Zide's on Munda, and Dyen and Aberle's on Athapaskan (yet more examples are listed in the latter, 1974: 1).

The present article uses similar methods to analyse the terminology of Burushaski, a genetically isolated language consisting of two dialects spoken in the western Karakorum. This proves to agree essentially with the symmetric or two-line prescriptive terminologies found in the Himalayas to the east and in south and central India. The presence of such terminologies has not been suspected in this area until very recently, yet it is not the only instance: Shina, a neighbouring Indo-European (IE) language, also proves to have the same basic pattern. Shina is therefore anomalous, in that it belongs to a language family not normally associated with this type of kin classification, either at the present day or at any recorded period in the past (see especially the discussion of this in Szemérenyi 1978). Yet despite this anomaly it is not unique. The well-established contrast between the terminologies of north and south India (including Sri Lanka) is also largely one between IE and Dravidian languages, but the correspondence is not a complete one: in areas of transition there are a number of terminologies which are 'Dravidian' in their semantic configuration but lexically IE (e.g. Marathi, Konkani, Sinhalese – see Trautmann 1981: 147 sqq.). Other examples occur in the Himalayas, e.g. Pahari.

Historical linguistics would tend to suggest that these are all the result of innovation because of the absence of prescription from the terminologies of the recorded ancestral languages, as well as from any of the proto-languages that have been reconstructed from them. Conversely, such innovations seem on the face of it to contravert the theoretical position that non-prescriptive terminologies do not become prescriptive. In the present case the contradiction can quite easily be overcome, and the final section of the article will argue how.

The linguistic and ethnographic background

First, however, it will be useful to give a more detailed account of the linguistic geography of the area and to sketch in the ethnographic background.

Burushaski itself has two main dialects. According to the 1931 Census of India, the last available for this area, the dialect most usually called Burushaski (abridged here to Bu) was spoken by about 20,000 people in the Hunza and Nagir valleys, while Werchikwar (abridged here to Wk) was the dialect of about 7,500 people in the Yasin valley to the west.[1] The most recent figures record a population of 26–30,000 Burusho for the Hunza and Nagir valleys, out of a total Burusho population of about 60

1984: 117), while somewhat earlier Jettmar gave a figure of almost 50,000 Burushaski speakers in Hunza, Nagir and Yasin together (1959: 90). Compared with Bu, Wk 'is markedly different and is certainly to be ranked as a distinct dialect' (D. Lorimer 1927: 509), though probably not as a separate language by the conventional test of mutual intelligibility. It is closer to Nagir than to Hunza Bu (D. Lorimer 1937: 72), there being slight dialectal differences between these also, and even within Hunza itself (D. Lorimer 1935*a*: xlix). No connexion has ever been established between this tiny group of dialects and any other language family, not even those in its immediate area. Attempts to link it with certain Caucasian languages have not won lasting acceptance, nor has Barbour's proposed link with the Munda languages of Bihar and Orissa, on the basis of the pronominalised affixation and vigesimal counting common to both (1921). (These and other even less plausible theories are discussed in Morgenstierne 1935: xii sqq.)

Although there are a number of IE languages in this general area, two in particular have had a marked influence on Burushaski, namely Shina on Bu and Khowar on Wk, though influence has by no means been in only one direction. Lorimer thought that Gilgit was entirely Bu-speaking before the Shen invasions. In his day Shina had only intruded into the lower Hunza and lower Nagir valleys, but the Shen's high social status in the area – one section of them has provided the local rulers for at least six centuries – was reflected in that of their language. This is especially so of Nagir, with more Shina speakers than Hunza, and these linguistic influences have been reinforced by frequent intermarriages between Shen and Burusho. By contrast, Dumaki, the IE language of the Doms or Berichos, professional musicians and blacksmiths of the area, has had no discernible influence on Bu, this being due partly to their small numbers and relatively recent immigration into the area from Baltistan and further south, and partly to the low status associated with their professions (D. Lorimer 1935*a*: xliii; 1937: 66, 69–71, 96).

In Yasin, Wk is the indigenous language, but it has been influenced by IE Khowar, the language of the traditional ruling Khushwaqt and Kator families, who have been in the area for some two centuries (D. Lorimer 1937: 71, 96–8). Generally, Wk, like Yasin itself, has been less subject to foreign influences than Bu and its area (D. Lorimer 1935*a*: liv–lv; Berger 1962: 43), but Khowar seems to have been gaining ground in the valley in recent decades: in Lorimer's day, Wk was the mother tongue of almost all its 8,000 inhabitants (1937: 71), but today Khowar is reported to be the language of a third of all Yasinis (Morin & Dagenais 1977: 308). In both Yasin and Hunza, Urdu is increasingly making an impact through the army, administration, schools, Gilgit market, etc. (Morin *et al.* 1979: 137; Berger 1962: 43), while Wakhi has long been spoken in the north of both valleys. Unlike Shina and Khowar, however, neither seems to have had any significant influence over Burushaski kinship terminology, and we can henceforward disregard them both.

The remaining languages of this area are Turki to the north, of little significance in the present context, and some Tibeto-Burman (TB) languages to the east, of which Balti is an immediate neighbour of Bu. It is possible that these

realised; I have discussed this possibility as regards kin terms at greater length elsewhere (Parkin 1987), so I will restrict myself here to brief comments at appropriate points in the analysis below.

A great deal of what little ethnography there is on the Burusho is now quite old, although in recent years interest has been revived by some French, German and Canadian linguists and anthropologists. The complexities of their social organisation and stratification were described briefly by D. Lorimer (1935*a*: xlii–xliv), whose sketch has been elaborated and broadly confirmed since (Tahir Ali 1981: 234 sqq.; Frémont 1984). The basis of the economy is the irrigated cultivation of cereals and vegetables (Lorimer 1935*a*: xlii, xliv). As for religion, the Burusho of Hunza have been Ismailites since about the second quarter of the nineteenth century, after a roughly equivalent period of Shiism; Nagir has remained Shiite, however (D. Lorimer 1935*a*: xli). Islamisation does not seem to have affected social values markedly, at least not before the 1930's, when women still went unveiled and were considered by the Lorimers to be free and open in their ordinary interaction with men. There is, however, apparently one exception: although the traditional alliance system seems to have enjoined patriclan exogamy and a ban on first-cousin marriage, Leitner (1893) recorded the occasional indulgence of the wealthy in the latter as far back as the 1860's, a trend confirmed by the Lorimers seventy years later; most probably, this is simply the common Islamic preference for marriage between the children of two brothers. Although the terminology is prescriptive, there is no mention in the literature of any positive marriage rules. Marriage is to some degree by choice, though the negotiations are carried out via an intermediary or *herangush*. There are apparently some counter-prestations as well as a brideprice, and the ceremony is carried out partly in the bride's father's house and partly in the groom's; postmarital residence is virilocal (D. Lorimer 1935*a*: xlvi; 1935*b*: 299, 305; E. O. Lorimer 1936: 250–1; 1938: 15; Leitner 1893: 24). The presence in D. Lorimer's dictionary of a word for 'co-wife' (Bu *umagus*, from *gus*, 'wife'—1938: 517) indicates some polygyny.

The Burushaski terminology

The analysis of the Burushaski terminology which follows uses all the relevant published and in one case unpublished data available. The former consists chiefly of D. Lorimer's dictionary (1938) for both dialects and Berger 1974 for Wk, but these are supplemented by two useful older sources (Leitner 1893 and Biddulph 1880) and by Morin *et al.* 1979. Even though these are all linguistic rather than anthropological in content and therefore do not concentrate on kinship terminology as such, they nevertheless convey sufficiently detailed information to allow the nature of the Burushaski system to emerge. Moreover, Dr Adam Nayyar has recently collected further very useful information on Bu (from Hunza) which adequately fills most of the remaining gaps.[2]

Table 1 gives a consolidated list of the published kin terms and their recorded glosses for the two main dialects, with Nayyar's [illegible]

separate column. Note that the following abbreviations are used for kin specifications in this article:

P	parent	G	sibling	C	child	E	spouse
F	father	B	brother	S	son	H	husband
M	mother	Z	sister	D	daughter	W	wife
os	opposite sex	ss	same sex	ms	male speaker		
e	elder	y	younger	ws	female speaker		

The abbreviations os, ss, ms, ws, refer to the whole specification when in final position.[3] Some descriptive terms and loans from other languages of no particular systemic significance have been omitted in table 1, being synonyms of the more usual indigenous terms generally restricted to ruling circles. Those loans which cast some light on the analysis, however, have been retained.

We start with the outer reaches of the terminology. In the +3 level, Wk has *di-bap* (PPF), *di-waw* (PPM), of which at least the former seems to be IE. In the +2 level, both main terms seem to be loans. Bu *dado* (PF) is certainly IE, while Wk *pe* (PF) and Bu *api* (PM—perhaps PF also, but Leitner (1893: 22) says that *dado* is better) is probably TB. It certainly seems to be a separate term from Bu *bapo*, Wk *bap*, PF, which is IE (D. Lorimer 1938: 469; Berger 1974: 132; Morin *et al.* 1979: 140).

There is no lexical connexion with the reciprocal −2 level, where Wk *mes*, Bu *amis*, is the sole recorded term. This also seems to be TB in origin, even though it is normally applied there to the +2 level only. If this is a loan, it means that Burushaski has no indigenous terms in the +2 or −2 levels of its terminology. This is to say the least unusual, but it is possible to suggest an explanation on comparative grounds. It is quite common for symmetric prescriptive terminologies elsewhere (e.g. in Australia, South America, central India) to have terms equating these levels. Sometimes such equations incorporate ego's level also, which reinforces still further the sense of unity they provide between sets of alternating genealogical levels. (A particularly good example of this is the terminology of the Juang in central India – see McDougal 1964: 329). Possibly the original Burushaski terminology followed the same principle, the indigenous terms that covered these levels now being found only in ego's level (discussed below), having been replaced in the others by TB loans.

The remainder of the analysis will deal with the +1, −1 and ego's level in that order. In Bu, *uy*, *aya*, *augah* designate both F and FB, and are probably connected with *aa*, *au*, *u* in Wk.[4] The Wk forms, however, are today restricted to F, and an IE loan, *tati*, serves as both F and FB. Similarly, while *mi* (like Nayyar's *mama*[5]) is both M and MZ in Bu, it is restricted to M in Wk, where *nani*, another IE loan (Berger 1974: 167), is both M and MZ. Thus in Bu, P = PssG, while in Wk even the IE loans have this pattern, despite the restriction of the indigenous terms to P only.

The terms for cross relatives demand rather more discussion. Fairly straightforward is Bu *ntso*, FZ, MBW, which has a Wk cognate in *nzu* (glossed as 'Tante (väterlicher- und mütterlicherseits)' by Berger—1974: 168, 214), while *ngo* appears in both dialects as MB.[6] More problematic is the root *nya*, which [illegible]

TABLE 1. *Burushaski kin terms*

Genealogical level	Bu	Wk	Nayyar's data (Bu)
+3		†di-bap PPF di-waw PPM	
+2	¶api PM †dado PF †bapo PF	¶pe PF †bap PF	¶api PM †dado PF, PMB
−2	¶amis CS	¶mes CC	¶amis SC, SCE
+1	uy F, FB aya F, FB mi M, MZ mama M ¶nana MB, FZ ngo MB ntso FZ, MBW askir EF, WFB askus EM	u F aa, au F †tati FB mi M †nani M, MZ ¶nane PB, PZH ¶nene FZ ngu MB nzu PZ skir EF skus EM	augah F, FB mama M, MZ ¶nana FZ, MB, MBW, FZH askir HF askus WM
−1	i S ai D sagun ZC, WBC, HZC xakin SW arer DH	ye D ai, i D sagun GC xakin SW rar DH	ei S, ssGS ai D, ssGD asagun osGC akhaikin SW arar DH
0	¶acho Bms, Zws, 'brother-in-law' ms, HZ ulus Bws, HB yas Zms, WZ rik WB, ZHms, BWws, HZ sildir DHFws, CEFms silgus CEMws uyer H hir H hapkuin H, W †jamant H, W us W umagus co-wife	¶acho Bms, Zws hulus Bws, HB, WB yast Zms rek WB, ZHms, BWws, HZ †sari WB; WZ? †saroni HB, WZ, BWms, ZHws †tuxmiran CEP yuher H hir H tin H us W	¶acho eB, eZ, HBW, WBW, WZH echo HeB ayas yB, yZ, WZ arik WeB oyar H os W

† = IE loan ¶ = TB loan

Lorimer nor Berger nor Morin *et al.* gloss it as an IE loan, however, even though they are all ready enough to record definite cases of borrowing elsewhere. In fact, on both semantic and lexical grounds it is more plausibly a loan from TB languages,[7] in which it is almost invariably applied to cross, not parallel +1 relatives, as in Burushaski but in

mentions it simply as an address term for MB, *ngo* (MB) and *ntso* (FZ) being 'third person pronouns', i.e. terms of reference (1880: xxv, xxxviii). In Bu, Leitner glosses it as MB, FZ, FZH, while Nayyar includes MBW as well (i.e. covering all +1 cross relatives of both sexes), and even Lorimer records it as FZ, MB.[8] As for Wk, Berger gives *nene* as FZ but not as MB. Morin *et al.* do not restrict the term to cross relatives, however, giving the (presumably identical) *nane* as 'oncle (maternel, paternel et par alliance)', and not giving it any female reference at all (1979: 147), thus completely contradicting Berger. This may simply reflect lack of discrimination on their part, but an alternative explanation is that they are right and other recent authorities wrong, and that the Wk +1 pattern is changing from one of P = PssG ≠ PosG to one of PssG = PosG ≠ P. This would accord well with the break-up of the equations F = FB and M = MZ mentioned above. Clearly, however, the overall tendency is to regard *nana* as a term for cross relatives only, which are therefore opposed to parallel relatives in this level. Indeed, in Bu we can construct the pattern P = PssG(E) ≠ PosG(E), this being wholly characteristic of symmetric prescriptive terminologies; and a similar pattern can be discerned in Wk, despite its relatively greater instability.

To complete the picture in the +1 level, there are just two affinal terms: Bu *askir* (EF, WFB), Wk *skir* (EF); and Bu *askus*, Wk *skus* (both EM). Morgenstierne derives these from *hir*, 'man', and *gus*, 'woman', respectively (1945: 74), which may mean that they are new coinings absent from the original terminology. If this were indeed the case, it raises the possibility that the present-day terms for PosG(E) originally covered these specifications also, as in the ideal symmetric prescriptive scheme.

Turning to the reciprocal −1 level, we find Bu *i*, *ei*, Wk *ye* as S, and Bu *ai*, Wk *ai*, *i*, as D. In most sources, *sagun* appears as GC for both dialects. D. Lorimer tells us, however, that in Bu, at least, this term originally referred to ZC only, BC being equated with C, as is still often the case in practice (1938: 306). Nayyar's data expand on this by clearly separating all cross from parallel relatives in the formula C = ssGC ≠ osGC (*ei/ai* ≠ *sagun*). Furthermore, Leitner glosses *sagun* as WBC, HZC (though not as osGC), applying either descriptive terms or the terms for C to WZC, HBC. Taking all these sources together, therefore, we can construct a symmetric prescriptive configuration of meanings for the −1 level with the formula C = (E)ssGC ≠ (E)osGC. Lorimer's remark may, however, indicate that this area of the terminology, like its reciprocal in +1, is ceasing to separate cross from parallel relatives and is moving towards a non-prescriptive pattern of ssGC = osGC ≠ C.

The −1 affinal specifications SW and DH are designated by the terms *xakin* (both dialects) and *arar* (Bu), *rar* (Wk), respectively;[9] the former must be regarded as an independent term, despite its morphological similarity to *sagun*, as the forms recorded by Nayyar make clear (table 1). This separation of CE from (E)osGC parallels that in the reciprocal area of the terminology of EP from PosG(E), but unlike the terms for EP, those for CE are not (or not obviously) new coinings, and cannot be reduced any further. Thus in these two levels, the present-day terminology fails to encompass all the affinal specifications open to it, in view of its otherwise symmetric prescriptive nature (as in Munda—see

Ego's level seems to have been a little more unstable diachronically, in common with many other terminologies of this sort.[10] Nonetheless, the underlying pattern is readily discernible.

The treatment of cognatic kin is straightforward enough, both dialects being in agreement. ssG is *acho*, Zms is *yas* (Bu) or *yast* (Wk), and Bws is *ulus* (Bu) or *hulus* (Wk). All the Bu terms, however, as well as Wk *hulus*, have some extra, affinal, specifications. The possible reason for this will only become apparent when we have discussed *rik/rek*, the fourth term in this area of the terminology.

It would appear that, even though today restricted to the ss categories of WB, ZHms, HZ, BWws, Bu *rik* was formerly applied to all EG/GE categories. D. Lorimer implies that it once covered at least WZ, HB and BWms also by saying that these meanings (plus FBSWms, who in this context can be regarded as a classificatory BW) are now 'rare, obsolete and objectionable' (1938: 303—he gives no reason for this). If this is indeed the case, then it would seem that the rejected os categories have been transferred to the cognatic terminology, HB and possibly ZHws going to *ulus* and WZ to *yas*—a logical distribution in respect of the particular relative-sex attributes of these terms (see above). In Wk, *rek* is similarly restricted to ss affines, but here the os ones are covered by a Shina loan, *saroni*. This must have been absent from the terminology at one time, which suggests that *rek* too formerly applied to all EG and GE categories, os as well as ss.

There are admittedly one or two anomalies to be noted. In Bu, there is redundancy in the fact that *acho* is recorded not only as ssG, but also as HZ and 'brother-in-law' ms, since these affines are covered already by *rik*, even in its present-day reduced aspect. Similarly, in Wk *hulus* is recorded as HB by both Berger and Lorimer, and as WB by Berger, even though these are covered by *saroni* and *rek* respectively. There seems to be no particular systemic reason for this, and they can probably be regarded purely as synonyms and/or as an aspect of address usage. Berger also records WB as *sari*, another Shina term, no doubt simply a product of bilingualism.[11] Finally, Nayyar's data are in some respects at variance with the foregoing. In particular, he contrasts *acho* and *yas* as eG/yG rather than ssG/Zms, the only source to give any relative-age specifications. This may reflect the fact that *acho* is apparently yet another TB loan, of a root generally meaning eB. Also, no one else records his *echo* (HeB). He confirms *rik* as WB and *yas* as WZ, however, and his reporting some EGE as well as eG specifications for *acho* is significant since it gives us an equivalence that is entirely consistent with the ideal symmetric prescriptive scheme, as too is its separation from EG/GE categories (probably all denoted by *rik/rek* in the ancestral terminology).

Despite these anomalies, however, we can arrive at the following as the basic meanings for these four terms:

acho = ssG; *yas(t)* = Zms; *(h)ulus* = Bws; *rik/rek* = EG, GE

If the ancestral terminology was of symmetric prescriptive type, as the +1 and −1 levels strongly suggest, then *rik* would, in fact, have been the term for cross cousin as well as EG, GE, while the remaining terms would have covered parallel cousins as well as siblings. This is broadly confirmed by the only two sources to take any account of terms for cousins: Leitner simply says that PGS

B (1893: 22), while Biddulph records PGS as *acho* and PGD as *yas* (1880: xxvii). Such data are hardly exact enough for anthropological purposes, but together with the silence of other sources they do suggest that today, perhaps under IE influence (and as in Munda) *all* PGC categories and not just PssGC ones have become equated with siblings. Conversely *rik*, the postulated term for PosGC in the original terminology, is now confined to the EG and GE specifications formerly associated with it—and in fact to only some of these, in view of the evidence of further, perhaps more recent, contraction (i.e. still within living memory in Lorimer's day—see again 1938: 303).

There are a few other terms from ego's level to be discussed. Bu *sildir*, DHFws, CEFms, and *siligus*, CEMws are, like *askir* and *askus*, derived from *hir* and *gus* respectively (Morgenstierne 1945: 72). Once again, this suggests the coining of new terms to cope with changes in the ancestral terminology, in which CEPss referents would have appeared as cross cousins and CEPos ones as osG. In Wk, Berger records *tuxmiran*, a loan from Khowar, for this field, glossing it as 'Schwiegereltern (gegenseitig), Gegenschwäher' (1974: 182), which can be translated as 'reciprocally used term for EP', i.e. CEP. The fact that a loan is used here suggests again the absence of a specific term, and therefore of an isolable CEP category, from the original terminology. No particular significance is to be drawn from the terms for spouse, since these commonly attract individualising terms even when in principle assimilable to some cross-cousin category. Indigenous independent terms exist in *oyar*, H, and *os*, W (from *gus*, 'woman'—Berger 1974: 184), though at least one IE is loan is also present (*jamant*, for both H and W), and *hir*, 'man', is also used for H.[12]

What, then, might have been the form of the ancestral Burushaski terminology, taking all these factors into account? Table 2 gives the most plausible version:

TABLE 2. The ancestral Burushaski kinship terminology.
a) The terms with their English glosses

+2	= *o level*	PP etc.
+1	uy, aya mi, mama	F, FB M, MZ } & PssGE
	ngo, nana ntso, nana	MB, FZH FZ, MBW } & EP?
o	acho ulus yas	ssG Bws, CEFws Zms, CEMms } & PssGC, EGE
	rik	EG, GE; PosGC? CEPss?
	uyer us	H W
−1	ei ai sagun arar xakin	S, (E)ssGS D, (E)ssGD (E)osGC DH SW
−2	= *o level*	CC etc.

b) Matrix diagram of the semantic scheme

	‖	X
+1	uy/aya ♂ mi/mama ♀	ngo/nana♂ ntso/nana ♀
+2/o/−2	acho/ulus/yas	rik/uyer/us
−1	ci ♂ ai ♀	sagun/arar ♂ sagun/xakin ♀

This shows that in all essentials the Burushaski kinship terminology is a symmetric prescriptive one, distinguishing cross from parallel relatives in all three medial levels, though using TB loans and merging them in the outer two. The nature of the equations uniting cross relatives in +1 and −1, as well as the overall symmetry of terms for ego's direct affines in his own and the +1 levels, ensure that this is not an asymmetric, three-line terminology, and there are no terms linking adjacent levels. There are some indications that this scheme is beginning to change in a non-prescriptive direction. Fundamentally, however, this is a remarkably economical example of such a terminology, with relatively few sex distinctions, virtually no evidence of relative age, and possibly, at one time, the uniting of the +2 and −2 levels with ego's through common terms (see table 2b).

Shina

We have already noted that at least one terminology of this area, that of Shina, has certain features similar to Burushaski, especially in the +1 level.[13] In the Kohistani dialect, *phipi* is both FZ and MBW, though IE cognates of this term are usually restricted to the former specification. In addition, there is *bari aje* (literally 'big mother') as both MeZ and FeBW, and *cuni aje* (literally 'little mother') as both MyZ and FyBW. The latter equation also occurs in the central dialect as *cuni ma* ('little mother' again), and although no term is recorded for MeZ, *bari ma* ('big mother') is given for FeBW. Here too, *mamu*, usually just MB in other IE languages, is applied to FZH also. Finally, Nayyar records *pica* as FB, MeZH in the Hunza dialect (unpublished notes) and the lineal equations (in Needham's sense) *mālo*, F, FB, and *ajye*, M, MZ, in the Astor dialect (1986: 118).

Unlike these equations, the −1 pattern in Shina of C ≠ BC ≠ ZC is not in itself at all anomalous for Indic. But the terms recorded by Bailey and Nayyar (unpublished notes) for ZC (*savuo* or *sazu*, ZS, and *savui* or *sazui*, ZD) closely resemble those given by Leitner for WBC (*sau* or *sazuo*, WBS, and *saui*, WBD), suggesting at least the equation ZC (ms?) = WBC; very similar too is Leitner's *jauo/-i* for HZC. HBC and WZC, by contrast, seem to be served by separate descriptive terms which utilise in part the terms for S and D, so that there is some resemblance here to the Burushaski pattern of C = (E) ssGC ≠ (E)osGC. D. Lorimer partly supports this by recording *zauwo/-i* as BCws and HZC, though less helpful is his addition of WZC to these (per-

1966: 552). Also untypical of Indic terminologies is the failure to separate wife-givers from wife-takers in ego's level. Turner has *jaze*, BWws, HZ (1966: 551), which has been confirmed recently by Nayyar's *zaze*, BW, HZ (unpublished notes) and Turner also records *sa*, WZ, BWws (though also as Z, PGD—1966: 804[14]). Similar equations do, however, occur in IE terminologies further west that are clearly not at all prescriptive in other respects (e.g. Waigali in Nuristan and Pashto in Swat (Jones 1974: 128; Barth 1959: 110)), so their occurrence in Shina may not be significant, despite the configuration of the +1 and −1 levels.

As for the other IE languages in contact with Burushaski, information on Wakhi and Khowar is too slight to allow any similar assessment to be made, but as far as the latter is concerned the few data we have are not encouraging. Biddulph records a common term for both FB and MB (*mik*) in opposition to *tutt*, F, and a common term for both MZ and FZ (*batch*) in opposition to *nun*, M (1880, Appendix H), giving the non-prescriptive pattern P ≠ PG. Nor does D. Lorimer's volume on Dumaki (1939) show appropriate evidence, which is perhaps not surprising in view of the Doms' relatively recent immigration into the area. The only possibly significant fact here is, as with Shina, the uniting of wife-givers and wife-takers in the equation *sheri*, WB, ZH, and *jaje*, HZ, BWws (1939: 210, 237), although, of course, the same objections apply here too. Dumaki also seems to have borrowed two terms from Burushaski, namely *sildir*, CEP, and possibly *mama*, M (1939: 207, 188; but cf. n. 5 above).

Nonetheless, the symmetric prescriptive character of the Shina terminology is evident enough in the +1 and −1 levels, and the fact that this is not at all typical of IE terminologies generally suggests that it is Shina that has moved in the direction of Burushaski rather than vice versa. Yet it would be a simplification to see this just in terms of the influence of one language over another, without taking account of the sociological factors that are present. Writing of the very similar situation found in parts of south India, Trautmann saw the problem in terms of word-for-word linguistic transfer and bilingualism between caste communities speaking different languages (1981: 147 sqq.). This also seems broadly true of the Karakorum, though here one must also take into account the expansion of Shina at the expense of Burushaski over the last few centuries. This expansion seems to have been the result of changes in language use rather than any large-scale human invasion: in other words, over the centuries a considerable part of the original Burushaski-speaking population has switched to Shina, the language of the numerically few but jurally dominant and socially prestigious invaders. While this has involved an almost total transfer of lexis, however, the scheme of kin classification, viewed as a semantic whole, has largely been preserved. In fact, we encountered an example of this very process when discussing the +1 level of the Burushaski terminology. Here, it will be recalled, the original lineal equations are still preserved in Bu along with Burushaski lexical material, but in Wk such material is now used only for F and M. Of course, Wk does have such equations in this level: but today these are constructed only with IE loans, and Burushaski lexis is not involved in them at all. (The rest of the local population has, of course, continued to speak

Conclusion

The presence of prescriptive terminologies, mostly two-line, in the Himalayas has long been realised, but until recently nothing of the sort was suspected as far west as Yasin. This raises other questions of local significance, such as whether any other Dardic languages have terminologies resembling Shina's, and whether the influence of TB languages on Burushaski has simply been lexical or is a matter of semantics also. The Shina terminology itself is an example of how IE terminologies can appear to become prescriptive, even though this pattern is not typical of them generally, and despite theoretical indications that such a change is unlikely. Clearly, though, the present situation is exceptional only in the replacing of the original inventory of terms with one from another language, this being just part of the process whereby a whole community seems to have changed languages while preserving the semantic configuration of its original kinship terminology.

The fact that this situation is not in itself unique in south Asia raises a further question as to whether this sort of event may have occurred more frequently in the past, especially in view of the long history of linguistic interaction in this region and the distinctiveness of most north Indian terminologies within IE. Also, it may be a factor worth taking into account in respect of other parts of the world where prescriptive and non-prescriptive terminologies are in contact.

NOTES

[1] The Burushaski dialect will be denoted by the abbreviation Bu, and Werchikwar by Wk, but when both dialects together are intended 'Burushaski' will be spelled out in full. The elements *Burush-* and *Werch-* are very probably cognate, but attached to the latter are the Khowar roots *-ik-* and *-war*, denoting respectively 'the people of a place' and 'language' (D. Lorimer 1935*a*: xlix). The usual name for the people is 'Burusho'.

[2] This new material, which concerns Shina as well as Bu, was utilised by Professor Georg Pfeffer in a paper prepared for the International Conference on Cultures of the Karakorum held in Gilgit in September 1983 (see Pfeffer 1984). I am most grateful to Professor Pfeffer for making this material available to me, as well as to Dr Nayyar for its original collection. Naturally, I accept full responsibility for the exact details of its interpretation here, though it is fair to add that some of the general conclusions had already been anticipated in the paper referred to.

[3] The transliterations of the terms are based on the recorded forms, but they do not follow these entirely and diacritics have been omitted, so they should not be regarded as rigorous. This should not, however, present a problem in the analysis, which is more concerned with the overall semantic scheme than the phonemic content of the terms.

[4] In both dialects, there may in fact be two roots involved here rather than just one (cf. n. 5 below and Parkin 1987: items 7 and 8).

[5] In form, *mama* is identical to the common Indic and Dravidian root for MB, and this may indeed be its source; but equally it may be indigenous, especially since the Burushaski term is applied to M and MZ, different in sex and the latter a parallel, not a cross relative. Terms for 'mother' etc. have a similar form to the above in many different parts of the world in circumstances which normally rule out the possibility of any historical connexion (cf. Leach 1971). This may be true in the present case, despite the geographical proximity between the occurrence of the terms, though the reduplication common to both may be a product of the linguistic convergence well known in south Asia (see Masica 1976).

[6] In his dictionary, D. Lorimer also records *ngo* as FB (1938: 276) and gives a passage from his collected parallel texts (1935*b*: 132, line 10, and p. 133) as supporting evidence. The term is clearly translated as MB in this passage, however.

[7] E.g. B[illegible]*ēne*, Kinnauri *nāne*, *ane*, Bhotia, Sherpa, Tamang *ani*, Tibetan *ne* (Parkin 1987: item 4). Benedict says that this root is 'practically universal' in TB and he derives it from Proto-TB **ni* ~ **nei* (1942: 317).

[8] And as FB (1938: 274), though once again this is at variance with the passages he cites in support of this interpretation (1935*b*: 130, lines 10, 15, 17, and p. 131), in which the term is nowhere to be found.

[9] *arar* bears a remarkable but probably fortuitous resemblance to *ara*, etc., the standard Munda root for DH, yZH (Parkin 1985).

[10] Compare, for example, Munda (Parkin 1985) and some TB terminologies (Allen 1975); a possible reason for this is discussed in the former reference.

[11] He also gives *sari* as WZ, but says that this gloss comes from Lorimer, who himself had placed a query beside it; I have not been able to find it in any of Lorimer's writings, however.

[12] The latter is also found in Turki (Cunningham 1854: 400; Raquette 1927: 52), though it is not clear which language has borrowed it from which.

[13] The chief sources for Shina kin terms (Leitner 1893 and Bailey 1924) are now very old, but they have been confirmed to some extent by other recent data collected by Nayyar on the Shina of Hunza (unpublished) and the Shina of Astor, further south beyond Gilgit (1986). In view of the relatively small amount of available information and the age of much of it no extended analysis of the Shina terminology will be attempted here.

[14] Cf. Nayyar's *sas* for Astor Shina (1986: 118); unfortunately he does not give any affinal terms for this dialect.

REFERENCES

Allen, N. J. 1975. Byansi kinship terminology: a study in symmetry. *Man* (N.S.) **10**, 80–94.

——— 1976. Sherpa kinship terminology in diachronic perspective. *Man* (N.S.) **11**, 569–87.

——— 1986. Tetradic theory: an approach to kinship. *J. anthrop. Soc. Oxford* **17**, 87–109.

Bailey, T. G. 1924. *Grammar of the Shina language*. London: Royal Asiatic Society.

Barbour, P. L. 1921. Buruçaski, a language of northern Kashmir. *J. Am. Orient. Soc.* **41**, 60–72.

Barth, F. 1959. *Political leadership among Swat Pathans*. London: Athlone Press.

Benedict, Paul K. 1942. Tibetan and Chinese kinship terms. *Harvard J. Asiat. Stud.* **6**, 313–37.

Berger, H. 1962. Der Stand der Burušaski-Forschung. *Bull. int. Comm. urgent anthrop. ethnol., Res.* **5**, 42–4.

——— 1974. *Das Yasin-Burushaski (Werchikwar)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Biddulph, J. 1880. *Tribes of the Hindu Koosh*. Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing.

Cunningham, A. 1854. *Ladak, physical, statistical and historical: with notes of the surrounding countries*. London: Wm. H. Allen & Co.

Dole, G. E. 1957. *The development of patterns of kinship nomenclature*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.

——— 1972. Developmental sequences of kinship patterns. In *Kinship studies in the Morgan centennial year* (ed.) Priscilla Reining. Washington: Anthropological Society.

Dyen, Isidore & David F. Aberle 1974. *Lexical reconstruction: the case of the Proto-Athapaskan kinship system*. Cambridge: Univ. Press.

Fêng Han-yi 1937. The Chinese kinship system. *Harv. J. Asiat. Stud.* **2**, 141 sqq.

Frémont, Annette 1984. Remarques sur l'organization des sociétés parlant le burushaski. *Bull. d'Études ind.* **2**, 117–22.

Goodenough, Ward H. 1956. Componential analysis and the study of meaning. *Language* **32**, 195–216.

Jettmar, K. 1959. Urgent tasks of research among the Dardic peoples of eastern Afghanistan and northern Pakistan. *Bull. int. Comm. urgent anthrop. ethnol. Res.* **2**, 85–96.

Jones, S. 1974. *Men of influence in Nuristan*. London, New York: Seminar Press.

Leach, Edmund 1971. More about 'mama' and 'papa'. In *Rethinking kinship and marriage* (ed.) Rodney Needham. London: Tavistock.

Leitner, G. W. 1893. *The Hunza and Nagyr handbook* (2nd edn). Woking: Oriental University Institute.

Lorimer, D. L. R. 1927. A Burushaski text from Hunza. *Bull. Sch. orient. Stud.* 4, 505–31.
——— 1935*a*/1935*b*/1938. *The Burushaski language* (3 vols). Oslo: Instituttet Sammenlignende Kulturforskning.
——— 1937. Burushaski and its alien neighbours: problems in linguistic contagion. *Trans. philol. Soc.*, 63–98.
——— 1939. *The Dumaki language*. Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt N.V.
Lorimer, E. O. 1936. Peasant life in Hunza. *Geogr. Mag.* 3, 235–54.
——— 1938. The Burusho of Hunza. *Antiquity* 12, 5–15.
Lounsbury, F. G. 1956. A semantic analysis of the Pawnee kinship usage. *Language* 32, 158–94.
McDougal, C. 1964. Juang categories and joking relationships. *SWest. J. Anthrop.* 20, 319–45.
Masica, Colin P. 1976. *Defining a linguistic area*. Chicago: Univ. Press.
Morgenstierne, G. 1935. Introduction. In *The Burushaski language* vol. 1 (by) D. L. R. Lorimer. Oslo: Instituttet Sammenlignende Kulturforskning.
——— 1945. Notes on Burushaski phonology. *Norsk Tiddsskr. Sprogvid.* 13, 61–95.
Morin, Y.-C. & L. Dagenais, 1977. Les emprunts ourdous en bourouchaski. *J. Asiat.* 265, 305–43.
———, J. Presot & E. Tiffou 1979. Complément au lexique du bourouchaski. *J. asiat.* 267, 137–53.
Nayyar, Adam 1986. *Astor: eine Ethnographie*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
Needham, Rodney 1967. Terminology and alliance. 2, Mapuche, conclusions. *Sociologus* 17, 39–53.
——— 1974. The evolution of social classification: the Warao case. *Bijdr. Taal- Land- Volkenk.* 134, 16–43.
Parkin, R. J. 1985. Munda kinship terminologies. *Man* (N.S.) 20, 705–21.
——— 1987. Tibeto-Burman and Indo-European loans in Burushaski kinship terminology. *Bull. Sch. Or. Afr. Stud.* 50/2.
Pfeffer, Georg 1984. Kin classification in Hunza. *J. cent. Asia* 7, 57–67.
Raquette, G. 1927. *English-Turki dictionary*. Lund: Acta Universitatis Lundensis.
Service, Elman R. 1960. Kinship terminology and evolution. *Am. Anthrop.* 62, 747–63.
Szemérenyi, O. 1978. Studies in the kinship terminologies of the Indo-European languages. *Acta Iranica* 16, 1–240.
Tahir Ali 1981. Ceremonial and social structure among the Burusho of Hunza. In *Asian highland societies in anthropological perspective* (ed.) C. von Fürer-Haimendorf, Delhi etc.: Sterling Publishers.
Trautmann, T. 1981. *Dravidian kinship*. Cambridge: Univ. Press.
Turner, R. L. 1966. *A comparative dictionary of the Indo-Aryan languages*. London: Oxford Univ. Press.

CORRESPONDENCE

The cultural context of hunter-gatherer rock art

There should be more comparative study of the hunter-gatherer rock art of the various regions of the world, therefore Robert Layton's paper (*Man* (N.S.) 20, 434–53) is to be welcomed as far as it goes. This is not very far, as Layton clearly has been much more concerned with Australian Aboriginal art than with San rock art; and draws his data for the latter from only two publications among the many in the now extensive literature on the subject—two that express much the same point of view about theories which are currently being somewhat warmly debated. Both his sources, as Layton makes clear, refer to portions of the Drakensberg of Natal and N.E. Cape Province, that is part of one of the six recognised rock art sub-regions south of the Zambesi R. (Rudner 1970: 1–3; Willcox 1984: 127–8). These differ in many ways and especially in the proportion of the animals represented, so David Lewis-Williams's and Patricia Vinnicombe's theories, even if acceptable, can be accorded only limited validity until tested against the situation in the other sub-regions. Their argument depends heavily on the high proportion of eland in the paintings, as this is taken to mean that the animal had symbolic—even religious—significance to the San artists. It is necessary to consider alternative explanations for this fact.

Layton begins by stating that Lewis-Williams and Vinnicombe found the rock art of their research areas to be concentrated on a few species. This is not true: for example Vinnicombe (1976: 364) lists twenty-eight species painted, excluding obviously mythical creatures. Nevertheless it is true that the eland was by far the favourite animal subject. Combining Lewis-Williams's and Vinnicombe's statistics with those of Harald Pager who lists about twenty painted species from another part of the same sub-region (Pager 1971: 321) shows 67 per cent. of all animal paintings to be antelope and 57 per cent. of these to be of eland, out of about a dozen antelope species represented (Willcox 1984: 195).

An explanation of this disproportion that is far simpler—and therefore to be preferred—is and there are good hunter reasons for this, as I have said elsewhere (Willcox 1973: preface; 1983: 539). These are that the eland is the largest of the antelope, the bulls reaching to as much as 2000 lbs, so killing one meant many carefree days. It has tender flesh and is the only game animal that has much fat—greatly prized by the San—on its body. Also it is relatively easy to hunt, being slow and comparatively easily brought to a halt by exhaustion. Moreover it is the only large antelope that was common in the art sub-region concerned.

Put at its simplest—in terms of *meat*—the eland should greatly predominate over the small buck as a desired object, and hence as a 'pin-up' on the cave wall. The actual number of eland kills compared to others could not possibly be in the proportion in which they are painted, it is only proposed that they were the preferred—the dream—kill. And it follows naturally that the eland should figure equally prominently in San folklore.

It can also be argued that the artists might have chosen to paint eland, in preference to the other animals present, for purely aesthetic reasons—it is a noble-looking beast—and this purpose would not conflict with, but rather reinforce, the purely economic, meat-seeking, motive. This seems the more likely from the fact that the artists devoted more care to the actual painting, reserving the shaded polychrome technique and the depiction in difficult aspects almost entirely for eland.

If the eland was so frequently painted because 'of aspects of eland behaviour which made it an appropriate image of social interaction' as Layton summarises an argument of his mentors, then what was the reason for painting all the other animals? In other regions other animals predominate as subjects e.g. elephants in the S.W. Cape, giraffes and kudu in Zimbabwe.

It is also incorrect to draw theoretical inferences from the rarity (not absence as stated) of paintings of the black wildebeeste in the paintings. No one has ever reported seeing these animals in the mountains: they are strictly animals of the plains (Willcox 1984: 258–9). In the other art regions which include their natural